

While the CCS may seem viable on paper and help politicians to gain popularity, there are many issues with this sweeping legislation. Do not misinterpret this to mean that teachers should not be held accountable. Lawmakers put so much emphasis on the "what" that pedagogy is being overlooked. That is HOW to teach. Legislators have no idea of how children learn and develop. The standards are not always developmentally appropriate. This emphasis on lists of standards has also forced the development of curricula that is rushed and ill suited to address the needs of children. So, implementation may be in place, but that does mean it is being done well and benefiting our students.

Legislators are not educators. This CCS is not really working in the classrooms. It is too much sweeping reform - it has caused chaos not reform. (This not to say standards are bad - the question is what standards set by who?) This coupled with an ill conceived teacher evaluation plan does not bode well for the future of education. Administrators are NOT instructional leaders anymore as they should be required to be, but rather concerned with CCS and inputting data into the computer for evaluations. Is this what we want for our students? Is this change really for our students or for politicians that want the spotlight?

Are there studies being done to see if this is what really works? HOW do you know what you are proposing is working/right? What is the long term plan for our educational system? Is there a vision? Continual, rapid reform will fix nothing in the end. I would urge you to tread lightly, keeping in mind what is BEST for our students.

Be calculated

Do engage teachers/educators and the community/psychologists in the process

Be transparent - share the standards - and the rationale for what is included and WHY - are the standards educationally appropriate?

Be realistic - if you want "reform" to take hold it needs to be done slowly and deliberately - it has been to quick.

Evaluation - - intertwining test scores and teacher performance may lead to "teaching to the test." While this may sound good - what is being done in regards to poverty/parenting/parental education that will assist teachers? After all, students spend more time at home than with teachers. It seems that legislators, in part, want to place "blame" on teachers for many social issues and this is unjust. Are police officers rated on the fluctuation in crime rate? Doctors on the amount patients they cure?

Because the "new" evaluation process is laborious, a great deal of time is spent uploading "evidence" into a database that will spit out a number and "rate" me - the rating comes after the principal reviews the "evidence" that has been uploaded. Multiply this times a building of 25 plus teachers and I ask, what is the point of an administrator? How much has been spent on this new evaluation process and again is it working? Is it really better? I personally do not feel that my skills have improved and that I am a better teacher due to the new evaluation system. It feels more like jumping through hoops and red tape for the sake of it. It has removed the element of

the conference where pedagogy was discussed and worked on. One can have all the best standards in the world, if an teacher cannot teach them well,

How much money was put into training administrators to "evaluate" this effort was quite big. What do you have in place to judge the success of this new program and HOW will this be articulated to teachers and the public?

Thank you,
Ed Wolf